

REMARKS

Claims 1-7 are pending in this application.

Claims 1 and 7 have been amended. Claim 2 has been canceled without prejudice. Amended claims 1 and 7 do not introduce any new subject matter.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102:

Reconsideration is respectfully requested of the rejections of claims 1, 3 and 5 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0054649 to Suemasa et al. ("Suemasa").

Applicants respectfully submit that Suemasa does not disclose or suggest a mixer connected to a first impedance matching circuit, a second impedance matching circuit, and a third impedance matching circuit, as recited in amended claim 1. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that amended claim 1 is not anticipated by Suemasa. In addition, for at least the reason that claims 3 and 5 depend from claim 1, claims 3 and 5 are also not anticipated by the cited reference.

Amended claim 1 recites a mixer connected to a first impedance matching circuit, a second impedance matching circuit, and a third impedance matching circuit. In contrast, Suemasa discloses two matching devices (120, 126) only. (See, e.g., Fig.1). Thus, Suemasa does not disclose a third impedance matching circuit.

Furthermore, Suemasa does not disclose a mixer. Examiner states that a power supply device (112) is a mixer. Applicants respectfully disagree. The mixer disclosed in claim 1 of the present invention is connected to impedance matching circuits. In contrast, the power supply device (112) includes components such as power source (122, 128), filters (118, 124) and matching devices (120, 126). Applicants respectfully submit that

the power supply device (112) including a matching device (120, 126) cannot be connected to the matching device (120, 126).

Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 1, 3 and 5 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) and that claims 1, 3 and 5 are in condition for allowance.

Reconsideration is respectfully requested of the rejections of claims 1, 3 and 5 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Japanese Patent Publication No. 2002-246368 to Wikuramanayaka ("Wikuramanayaka").

Applicants respectfully submit that Wikuramanayaka does not disclose or suggest a mixer connected to a first impedance matching circuit, a second impedance matching circuit, and a third impedance matching circuit, as recited in amended claim 1. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that amended claim 1 is not anticipated by Wikuramanayaka. In addition, for at least the reason that claims 3 and 5 depend from claim 1, claims 3 and 5 are also not anticipated by the cited reference.

Amended claim 1 recites a mixer connected to a first impedance matching circuit, a second impedance matching circuit, and a third impedance matching circuit. In contrast, Wikuramanayaka discloses a first matching device (120) and a second matching device (126) only. (See, e.g., Fig.1). Thus, Suemasa does not disclose a third impedance matching circuit.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 1, 3 and 5 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) and that claims 1, 3 and 5 are in condition for allowance.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103:

Claims 1-7

Reconsideration is respectfully requested of the rejections of claims 1-7 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,309,978 B1 to Donohoe et al. (“Donohoe”) in view of U.S. Patent Pub. No. US2003/0094239 A1 to Quon et al. (“Quon”).

Applicants respectfully submit that the amendment to independent claims 1 and 7 renders claims 1 -7 patentable over the cited references.

Applicants respectfully submit that Donohoe and Quon, when taken alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest a mixer connected to a first impedance matching circuit, a second impedance matching circuit, and a third impedance matching circuit, as recited in amended claims 1 and 7.

Donohoe does not disclose an impedance matching circuit. In contrast, power sources (31, 32, 33) are directly connected to a mixer (37).

Quon does not disclose a mixer, much less a mixer connected to a first, a second and a third impedance matching circuit. In contrast, Quon disclose a filter (34), not a mixer. Furthermore, the filter (34) is connected to only two matching circuits (30, 32).

Accordingly, even assuming, *arguendo*, that Donohoe and Quon were combined, the combination does not teach or suggest a mixer connected to a first impedance matching circuit, a second impedance matching circuit, and a third impedance matching circuit, as recited in amended claims 1 and 7.

As such, Applicants respectfully submit that amended claims 1 and 7 are patentable over Donohoe in view of Quon.

Further, for at least the reason that claims 2-6 depend from claim 1, claims 2-6 are also submitted to be patentably distinct over the cited references.

Claims 2, 4, 6 and 7

Reconsideration is also respectfully requested of the rejections of claims 2, 4, 6 and 7 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Suemasa in view of Donohoe.

In view of the previous arguments pertaining to the allowability of amended claim 1, Applicants respectfully submit that amended claim 1 is patentable over the cited references.

Claims 2, 4 and 6 depend upon claim 1. These dependent claims are believed to be patentable over Suemasa in view of Donohoe for at least the reason of their dependency on allowable independent claim 1. As such, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 2, 4 and 6 are patentable over Suemasa in view of Donohoe.

As such, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 2, 4 and 6 are patentable over Suemasa in view of Donohoe.

Applicants respectfully submit that Donohoe and Suemasa, when taken alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest a mixer connected to a first impedance matching circuit, a second impedance matching circuit, and a third impedance matching circuit, as recited in amended claim 7.

As stated above, neither Suemasa nor Donohoe teaches these features.

Therefore, based on the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejections of claims 2, 4, 6 and 7 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) and that claims 2, 4, 6 and 7 are in condition for allowance.

Claims 2, 4, and 6

Reconsideration is also respectfully requested of the rejections of claims 2, 4 and 6 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wikuramanayaka in view of Donohoe.

In view of the previous arguments pertaining to the allowability of amended claim 1, Applicants respectfully submit that amended claim 1 is patentable over the cited references.

Claims 2, 4 and 6 depend upon claim 1. These dependent claims are believed to be patentable over Wikuramanayaka in view of Donohoe for at least the reason of their dependency on allowable independent claim 1. As such, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 2, 4 and 6 are patentable over Wikuramanayaka in view of Donohoe.

Therefore, based on the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejections of claims 2, 4, and 6 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) and that claims 2, 4, and 6 are in condition for allowance.

Claim 7

Reconsideration is respectfully requested of the rejection of claim 7 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wikuramanayaka in view of Quon.

Applicants respectfully submit that the amendment to independent claim 7 renders claim 7 patentable over the cited references.

Applicants respectfully submit that Wikuramanayaka and Quon, when taken alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest a mixer connected to a first impedance matching circuit, a second impedance matching circuit, and a third impedance matching circuit, as recited in amended claim 7.

Wikuramanayaka does not disclose a third impedance matching circuit as argued above.

Quon does not disclose a mixer, much less a mixer connected to a first, a second and a third impedance matching circuit. In contrast, Quon disclose a filter (34), not a mixer, connected to only two matching circuits (30, 32).

Accordingly, even assuming, *arguendo*, that Wikuramanayaka and Quon were combined, the combination does not teach or suggest a mixer connected to a first impedance matching circuit, a second impedance matching circuit, and a third impedance matching circuit, as recited in amended claim 7.

As such, Applicants respectfully submit that amended claim 7 is patentable over Wikuramanayaka in view of Quon.

Therefore, based on the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claim 7 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) and that claim 7 is in condition for allowance.

An early and favorable reconsideration is earnestly solicited. If the Examiner has any further questions or comments, the Examiner may telephone Applicants' Attorney to reach a prompt disposition of this application.

Respectfully submitted,



Michael F. Morano
Reg. No. 44,952
Attorney for Applicants

F. Chau & Associates, LLC
130 Woodbury Road
Woodbury, New York 11797
TEL: (516) 692-8888
FAX: (516) 692-8889